UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,707	10/07/2005	Helmut D. Link	246472008500	6815
	7590 08/14/200 FOERSTER LLP	EXAMINER		
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD			SCHILLINGER, ANN M	
SUITE 400 MCLEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			3774	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/14/2009	PAPER

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/552,707	LINK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ANN SCHILLINGER	3774			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinuity will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This     Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 2.	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pre				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 2,3,5,6 and 9-13 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 2,3,5,6 and 9-13 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Cottle (US Pat. No. 5,888,227). Cottle discloses the following of the claimed invention: an
intervertebral joint prosthesis (1) comprising an upper cover plate (11) with an upper surface; a
lower cover plate (12) with a lower surface, where the lower and upper surfaces each have a
toothed central extent formed by elevations and depressions (18) and an untoothed lateral extent
located on an edge of the central extent in a coronal plane, the lateral extent extending from the
edge of the central extent to lateral sides of the lower and upper cover plates, the central extent
protruding beyond the lateral extent, and the lateral extent having an incline relative to a
transverse plane, the coronal plane and the transverse plane being taken relative to an orientation
of the prosthesis in an implanted position (Figs. 1-3; col. 3, lines 56-63).

Cottle discloses the limitations of claims 2, 3, 6, and 9 as shown in Figures 1-3 and in col. 3, lines 56-63 and col. 4, lines 1-10.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3774

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottle. Cottle discloses the claimed invention except for the inclination measurements claimed by the Applicant. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed inclination measurements, since it has been held that where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges of the apparatus involves only routine skill in the art.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottle in view of Michelson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,083,228). Cottle discloses the invention substantially as claimed, however, Cottle does not disclose an instrument set used to prepare the vertebral bodies to accommodate the prosthesis. Michelson teaches an intervertebral instrument set used to prepare the vertebral bodies to accommodate the prosthesis in col. 2, lines 12-47 and col. 7, lines 11-49 for the purpose of providing adequate space and support for the prosthesis. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an instrument set used to prepare the vertebral bodies to accommodate the prosthesis in order to provide adequate space and support for the prosthesis.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottle in view of Errico et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0069586). Cottle discloses the invention substantially as claimed, however, Cottle does not specifically disclose prosthesis with a width that is more than 1.63 times as great as the depth. If not inherent in Cottle, Errico et al. teaches an intervertebral prosthesis with a width that is more than 1.63 times as great as the depth in paragraph 0016 for the purpose of allowing the prosthesis to fit properly within a correspondingly dimensioned

Art Unit: 3774

intervertebral space. In addition, Errico et al. indicates that the prosthesis may be given a plurality of width and depth combinations, to properly fit a particular patient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a prosthesis with a width that is more than 1.63 times as great as the depth in order to allow the prosthesis to fit properly within a correspondingly dimensioned intervertebral space.

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9-13 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANN SCHILLINGER whose telephone number is (571)272-6652. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 9 a.m. to 4 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Isabella can be reached on (571) 272-4749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/552,707 Page 5

Art Unit: 3774

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 3774

/DAVID ISABELLA/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3774